

**Central Alameda County Freeway System Operational Analysis
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting
Meeting Notes**

Monday, January 8, 2007
2:30 p.m.

City of Hayward
City Hall
777 B Street, Room 2A
Hayward, CA

Agenda Item 1. Introductions and Sign-in: See attached sign-in sheet for attendance.

Agenda Item 2. Notes from 11/29/06 TAC Meeting: Bob Bauman of Hayward noted that the Notes satisfactorily reflect the discussion at the meeting, but wanted to add that a resolution regarding Project T has since been attained.

Agenda Item 3. Screening of Potential Improvement Projects: Beth Walukas of ACCMA introduced the subject of screening and asked for feedback. Paul Krupka of Kimley-Horn gave an overview of the memorandum. The following points highlight the ensuing discussion.

- Art Dao of ACTIA noted that Right-of-Way is typically thought of in physical terms, but it also has dimensions of political/community acceptance and time/money. He noted the time/money aspect may be covered by Time to Construct.
- Bob Bauman of Hayward agreed with the projects identified to drop from further analysis. He asked whether project requiring Right-of-Way included taking houses, and noted that he understood Project U, I-580/Redwood Road, did. Art indicated Project U required taking five houses and part of a mortuary.
- Bob asked whether red lines on the sketches indicated elimination of features. Paul said they did. Bob suggested that the delineation and labeling on the sketches need to be made consistent.
- Roxy Carmichael-Hart of Hayward asked whether Project X, Add Auxiliary Lanes on I-880 from Tennyson to Industrial is valid. Paul noted that auxiliary lanes already exist on this segment. The consensus was to delete or change Project X.
- Keith Cooke of San Leandro asked for clarification regarding what process we should be using in this meeting to give Kimley-Horn and ACCMA staff feedback. The consensus was to work through the list project by project.
- Keith commented that Right-of-Way on Project D (NB I-238 Connector to I-880 and Washington Ramp Modification) is "doable" so it should not be classified as a Large impact. He also thought Constructability should be Medium, not Large.

Meeting Notes (Cont'd)
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting – January 8, 2007

- Bob asked whether the options shown on the sketch for Project I, I-880/Industrial Way Interchange, were considered, as the description just says NB off-ramp. Paul noted that options could be considered. Art noted that this interchange was included in the Route 84 Realignment Environmental Document.
- Bob noted that on Project K, Whipple Road Interchange, the color for optional improvements was too close to the color for elimination.
- Bob noted that Right-of-Way for Project Q, W. A Street Interchange was available and therefore the rating should be Small, not Large.
- It was noted that if Project S, SR 92/Industrial Blvd. Interchange, required a new overcrossing structure, the Constructability impact should be Large.
- Art suggested that Project U, I-580/Redwood Road, should show Small impact for Time to Construct and reiterated that Right-of-Way was resolved.
- Rubin Woo of Caltrans noted that the SR92/I-880 Interchange includes the auxiliary lanes from Tennyson to Industrial Parkway West, so Project X should be deleted. Roxy asked why a project there was listed in the CMA list for projects to be considered for STIP augmentation. Beth indicated she would check into this matter.
- Rubin suggested adding a Comments column to the table to help document discussion about alternatives.

Agenda Item 4. Identification of Alternative Packages: Beth introduced the topic and Paul gave an overview of the memorandum contents. Jean Hart of ACCMA asked the TAC for feedback on categories as well as projects listed in categories. The following points summarize the ensuing discussion.

- Roxy said she favored the geographic breakdown.
- Jim Ogren of ACTIA asked whether Project T, I-580/Strobrige Off-Ramp, should be in the Mainline Operations or Capacity Expansion package.
- Art noted he liked the packaging presentation because it provided the ability to “slice or wedge” projects in different ways. He also noted that ITS improvements are important as they help squeeze more capacity out of the system. He noted that adding auxiliary lanes and widening ramps are still considered operational improvements but require more physical changes. Art suggested considering short- and long-term operational improvements as opposed to capacity expansion. The presentation of improvements must consider the key audiences – Caltrans and the CTC.
- Jean noted that we need to consider what performance measures will apply to each package.
- Jim asked for a graphical representation of the packages.
- Cheryl Chi of Caltrans asked how the evaluation would work. Paul noted that benefits and costs would be summed by package to determine cost-effectiveness. He also noted that the supportive analysis would also allow for interpretation of benefits of improvements within the packages. Cheryl asked if that meant each improvement would be analyzed. Paul said no – the intent is to evaluate packages and use the analysis results to help characterize benefits of individual improvements.
- Beth offered to bring the evaluation process to the TAC for review and consideration.

Meeting Notes (Cont'd)
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting – January 8, 2007

Agenda Item 5. Update on Model Development: Beth noted that development of both models was delayed and she would bring an updated schedule to the TAC at the next meeting.

Agenda Item 6. Approach to Expediting Approval of the LATIP: Beth gave an overview of the memorandum in the packet. Keith indicated it sounded like a good plan. Art indicated it was critical to get the LATIP in front of Caltrans and the CTC as soon as practicable.

Agenda Item 7. Other Business: No other business discussed.

Agenda Item 8. Next Meeting: The next meeting will be at the San Leandro City Hall on Wednesday, January 31, 2007 at 2:30 p.m.